



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 2
290 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10007-1866

SEP 06 1996

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

John G. Breem, Chairman of the Board
Sherwin-Williams Company, Inc.
101 Prospect Avenue, NW
Cleveland, OH 44115-1075

Re: Route 561 Dump Site, Gibbsboro, Camden County, New Jersey

Request for Information Pursuant to Comprehensive
Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act,
42 U.S.C. §§9601-9675.

Dear Mr. Breem:

This letter serves as a request for additional information with regard to the above referenced site. Prior to furnishing answers to these questions, please note that this 104e letter is followed by a Certification of Answers to the Request for Information, requiring notarization, that an officer or other responsible official of your company must sign certifying that the submitted information is true, accurate, and complete. A completed certification was omitted from Sherwin-Williams' October 19, 1995 response to EPA's August 4, 1995 Information Request Letter.

Please be aware that if at any time in the future the company obtains or becomes aware of additional information and/or finds that any portion of the submitted information is false, misleading, or misrepresents the truth, it must notify EPA. If any part of the company's response is found by the United States to be untrue, the signatory and the company may be subject to penalties including criminal prosecution.

Be advised that EPA is of the opinion that Sherwin-Williams' prior response to the first Information Request Letter is deficient and that this follow-up letter is an opportunity for Sherwin-Williams to address such deficiencies. EPA retains its

258052



right to take further action as it deems appropriate with regard to any deficiencies it may find in either Sherwin-Williams' prior response or Sherwin-Williams' response to this Information Request Letter.

Your response to this Request for Information should be postmarked or received at EPA within 30 calendar days of your company's receipt of this letter and should be mailed to:

Carl Howard
Assistant Regional Counsel
New Jersey Superfund Branch
Office of Regional Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region II
290 Broadway
New York, New York 10007-1866

with a copy to:

Thomas Budroe
On-Scene Coordinator
Emergency and Remedial Response Division
Removal Action Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region II
2890 Woodbridge Avenue
Edison, New Jersey 08837

The EPA is sending you two similar information request letters. You need not submit two identical responses to these two letters. You may wish to cross reference your responses where such responses are identical.

If you have any questions, or would like to discuss this matter with EPA, you may call Thomas Budroe at (908)906-6191, or, for legal matters, Carl Howard at (212)637-3216. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,



for Richard L. Caspe, Director
Emergency and Remedial Response Division

Enclosures

cc: T. Budroe, EPA-ERRD
M. Wiggett, EPA-ERRD
C. Howard, Esq., EPA-ORC

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RESPONDING TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

A. Directions

1. A complete and separate response should be given for each question.
2. Identify each answer with the number of the question to which it is addressed.
3. For each document produced in response to this Request for Information, indicate on the document, or in some other reasonable manner, the question to which it applies.
4. In preparing your response to each question, consult with all present and former employees and agents of your company whom you have reason to believe may be familiar with the matter to which the question pertains.
5. In answering each question, identify each individual and any other source of information (including documents) that was consulted in the preparation of the response to the question.
6. If you are unable to give a detailed and complete answer, or to provide any of the information or documents requested, indicate the reason for your inability to do so.
7. If you have reason to believe that an individual other than one employed by your company may be able to provide additional details or documentation in response to any question, state that person's name, last known address, phone number and the reasons for your belief.
8. If a document is requested herein but is not available, state the reason for its unavailability. To the best of your ability, identify the document by author, date, subject matter, number of pages, and all recipients of the document with their addresses.

Page 2 of Attachment to Letter from Richard L. Caspe

9. If anything is omitted from a document produced in response to this Request for Information, state the reason for, and the subject matter of, the omission.
10. If you cannot provide a precise answer to a question, please approximate but, in any such instance, state the reason for your inability to be more specific.
11. Whenever this Request for Information requests the identification of a natural person, or other entity, the person or entity's full name and present or last known address also should be provided.

B. Definitions

1. As used herein, at this time, the terms "Route 561 Dump Site" or the "Site" shall refer to the fenced area enclosing what is currently known as Block 18.07, Lot 9, and portions of Block 18.07, Lot 10 and Block 14.02, Lot 1 as identified on the municipal tax map in the Borough of Gibbsboro, Camden County, New Jersey.
2. As used herein, the term "hazardous substance" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 101(14) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §9601(14). The substances which have been designated as hazardous substances pursuant to Section 102(a) of CERCLA (which, in turn, comprise a portion of the substances that fall within the definition of "hazardous substance" under Section 101(14) of CERCLA) are set forth at 40 CFR Part 302.
3. As used herein, the terms "hazardous waste," "disposal" and "storage" shall have the meanings set forth in Sections 1004(5), (3) and (33) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), 42 U.S.C. §§6903(5), (3) and (33), respectively.
4. As used herein, the term "industrial waste" shall mean any solid, liquid or sludge or any mixtures thereof which possess any of the following characteristics:
 - a. it contains one or more "hazardous substances" (at any concentration) as defined in 42 U.S.C. §9601(14);

- b. it is a "hazardous waste" as defined in 42 U.S.C. §6903(5);
 - c. it has a pH less than 2.0 or greater than 12.5;
 - d. it reacts violently when mixed with water;
 - e. it generates toxic gases when mixed with water;
 - f. it easily ignites or explodes;
 - g. it is an industrial waste product;
 - h. it is an industrial treatment plant sludge or supernatant;
 - i. it is an industrial byproduct having some market value;
 - j. it is coolant water or blowdown waste from a coolant system;
 - k. it is a spent product which could be reused after rehabilitation; or
 - l. it is any material which you have reason to believe would be toxic if either ingested, inhaled or placed in contact with your skin.
5. As used herein, the "Sherwin-Williams plant" or the "Gibbsboro plant" shall refer to all operations in Gibbsboro, Voorhees, and Lucaston, New Jersey relating to Sherwin-Williams and John Lucas Company facilities and all their predecessors in interest of your company (as defined in paragraph 6, below) and all subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates and branches of your company.
6. As used herein, the terms "the company" and "your company" refer not only to Sherwin-Williams Company, Inc. as it currently is named and constituted, but also to all predecessors in interest of Sherwin-Williams Company, Inc. as well as all subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates and branches of Sherwin-Williams Company, Inc. or its predecessors.
7. As used herein, the term "release" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 101(22) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §9601(22), and includes any spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, discharging, injecting, escaping, leaching, dumping, or disposing into the environment, including the abandonment or discharging of barrels, containers, and other closed receptacles containing any hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant.

8. All terms not defined herein shall have their ordinary meanings, unless such terms are defined in CERCLA or RCRA, in which case the statutory definitions apply.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

1. Technical reports generated by Sherwin-Williams' consultant, Roy F. Weston, along with other historical information available to EPA and the NJDEP, and discussions with former employees and residents in the neighborhood surrounding the former plant, indicate that Sherwin-Williams operated the Gibbsboro, New Jersey plant from the 1930s to 1977. Several Weston reports state, "...in 1930 John Lucas and Co. merged with Sherwin-Williams of Cleveland, Ohio." This is in contradiction with information provided to EPA by Sherwin-Williams in your October 19, 1995 response to the August 4, 1995 Route 561 Dump Site Request for Information.

Accurately describe the events in the 1930s concerning the merger between John Lucas and Company and Sherwin-Williams. Specifically, discuss how Sherwin Williams obtained a controlling interest in the John Lucas Company through the purchase of the majority of the preferred stock. Detail the transaction and describe the financial, business and operating relationship between the two companies prior to, during, and after the merger. Discuss the difference between Sherwin-Williams' merger with John Lucas and Company of the 1930s versus Sherwin-Williams' merger with John Lucas and Company in 1967. Did John Lucas and Company retain its identity after the merger with Sherwin-Williams in the 1930s? Include in your discussion the financial, business, and operating relationship between the John Lucas and Company corporations in Philadelphia, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware.

2. In the October 19, 1995 response to the Route 561 Dump Site Request for Information, Allan Danzig stated, "Sherwin-Williams has not identified detailed information on manufacturing processes at the Gibbsboro plant through the 1940s". A similar statement was made with regards to identifying information on the formulation or manufacture of

pigments, whether dry colors were formulated, and regarding the use of arsenic in formulation or manufacturing.

Technical reports generated by Sherwin-Williams' consultant, Roy F. Weston, along with other historical information available to EPA and the NJDEP, and evidence gathered from discussions with former employees and residents in the neighborhood surrounding the former plant indicate that the John Lucas Company and/or Sherwin-Williams formulated and manufactured dry colors in the past, which included arsenic. A Weston report states, "Although primary products manufactured by the Lucas Company were varnish and lacquer, other products included dry colors (produced from chemical reactions/blending, filtering and drying)...", and "During the 1930s, Sherwin-Williams ceased dry color production."

Based on the preceding, EPA considers the responses to the questions in the Route 561 Dump Site August 4, 1995 Request for Information, with regard to John Lucas and Company and/or Sherwin-Williams' past manufacturing and formulating operations, raw materials, products, and pigment formulations to be insufficient and believes that Sherwin-Williams has not been forthright in its response. EPA requests that Sherwin-Williams reconsider these questions and provide more detailed information on each of these items.

Your response should include discussions on the use, manufacture, formulation and/or sale of Paris Green; Prussian, Chinese, and Milori Blue; Chrome Green; Chrome Yellow; and any other pigments used in any type of mixtures or combinations to produce these colors and/or other products containing these colors. Include all variations of the same pigment in this discussion. Provide the Colour Index constitution number, general formulas, composition, and physical characteristics for each of these materials.

Indicate the years that these materials were formulated and manufactured, and specifically, where these materials were produced (street name and address) in the Gibbsboro, Lucaston and Voorhees areas, as discussed above.

In Sherwin-Williams' October 19, 1995 response, Alan Danzig referred EPA to documents at the Crummy, Del Deo office concerning the products manufactured at the Gibbsboro plant from 1920 to when the company ceased operations. EPA was unable to interpret these documents during its inspection on April 17, 1996 since the product list was encoded. Provide the index to the code and the associated production records. It should be noted that the production records provided to EPA during this inspection on April 17, 1996 only contained information for the Gibbsboro plant in the 1970s.

3. EPA previously asked Sherwin-Williams to provide detailed information on how hazardous substances were stored at the Gibbsboro plant. Sherwin-Williams failed to provide such information to EPA. A technical report generated by Sherwin-Williams' consultant, Roy F. Weston, states, "According to information provided by Sherwin-Williams, raw materials (paint pigments) were stored in 55-gallon drums." Other sources indicate that pigments were received in bags.

Describe in detail how and where chemicals used at the Gibbsboro plant, including, hazardous substances, hazardous wastes and industrial wastes that were used, generated, manufactured or otherwise handled by your company at the Gibbsboro Plant, were stored while in use, re-use and/or prior to disposal. For what period of time and in what quantities were these materials stored or otherwise kept at the Gibbsboro plant? Include a detailed discussion on the area(s) of the plant that were used to store pigments, what types of pigments were stored (provide specific chemical names), and what became of the pigment and/or any other off-specification material or product that could not be reworked or sold.

Provide historical documentation outlining the company's policy and operating procedures for the "work-off" process for scrap or off-specification paints, lacquers, varnishes, and other chemicals. Include documentation of the process and general formulation for the "barn yard" paint. Where was this operation conducted at the Gibbsboro plant?

4. EPA believes that Sherwin-Williams provided EPA with insufficient information in its October 19, 1995 response to Question 3 of the Information Request Letter, concerning the locations of specific operations and processes at the Gibbsboro plant. As such, please identify the specific processes that took place in Buildings 57 and 62. Provide a list of the pigments and other materials that were stored in these two buildings during the period from 1920 to 1970. What types of finished products were stored in Buildings 55 and 58? Provide a detailed listing of the types of solvents, lacquers and varnishes that were stored among the 2,000 drums, triple stacked, behind Building 67. Were these raw or spent materials? What types of solvents were used to supplement the fuel in the boiler in Building 37?
5. Prior to the period when waste material was being disposed of at Buzby's Landfill and the area in the vicinity of Blocks 23 and 25 on United States Avenue across from the former plant location, where did Sherwin-Williams and/or John Lucas and Company dispose of its waste? In answering this, please consider each of the following items individually: solid waste; trash; drummed materials, including hazardous waste; process residues; tank washes; still bottoms; paint filters; baghouse dust; spill cleanup of raw materials and finished product, both inside the plant and at the rail lines near and along U.S. Avenue; pigment bags; floor sweepings; and bulk liquid and sludge wastes.

In addition, respond to each of the following items specifically (base the discussion on where this material was disposed of prior to the period in which Buzby's Landfill and the area in the vicinity of Blocks 23 and 25 on United States Avenue were being used by John Lucas and Company and/or Sherwin-Williams for disposal):

- EPA has reason to believe that during a period in the 1950s and 1960s, but not limited to these years, sludge and/or residues were pumped from the boiler room in Building 37 into drums that went to Buzby's Landfill. Two settling tanks behind Building 37 reportedly generated sludges and/or residues. Building 37 is also reported to have contained a

still which generated still bottoms. Provide an estimate of the quantity generated for each of these materials. Specifically state the location where these materials were disposed of.

- The paint strainer machine in Building 39 generated solids that were reportedly placed into cardboard boxes and disposed of. Provide an estimate of the quantity generated for this material. Specifically state the location where this material was disposed of.

- In the lacquer and paint departments, what was the final disposition of waste thinners, solvents, and scrap lacquers that could not be reused or reworked? Provide an estimate of the quantity generated for each of these materials. Specifically state the location where these materials were disposed of.

- In the "Sher-dye" process, provide an estimate of the quantity of material generated from the tank washes. Specifically state the location where this material was disposed of.

6. Include a discussion on the former tank farm on United States Avenue, including when it was first used, how long it was used, and the materials and quantities that were stored in the tanks during their existence for both John Lucas and Company and Sherwin-Williams operations.
7. Sherwin-Williams failed to provide any of the requested photos and diagrams in its response to the previous Route 561 Dump Site Request for Information. According to a Weston report, maps depicting the Site conditions in the 1940s are provided in a June, 1991 Weston work plan. Provide EPA with copies of these items and any other photos and diagrams, as requested previously.

8. What preservatives, fungicides, and/or additives were used in the protein-based paints manufactured at the Gibbsboro plant during the tenure of both John Lucas and Company and Sherwin-Williams? Estimate the quantities of these materials typically stored onsite, their storage method (type of container), and the location of the storage area.
9. Describe the manufacturing process and formulation for Kemwood Seal and the location of the process and storage area(s) at the Gibbsboro plant. Indicate the source(s) of the raw materials, an estimate of the quantities of raw materials used on an annual basis, the product application, and whether the product was ever used at the Gibbsboro plant. Estimate the quantity of Kemwood Seal manufactured at the Gibbsboro plant, on an annual basis, during the tenure of both John Lucas and Company and Sherwin-Williams. Describe what was done with the material that was either off-specification or could not be reworked or sold.
10. Describe the manufacturing process in which Dowicide A, G, and 6 were used and the location of the process and the storage area(s) at the Gibbsboro plant. Indicate the specific final product(s) from this process and whether the product was ever used at the Gibbsboro plant. Estimate the quantity of these specific final product(s) manufactured at the Gibbsboro plant, on an annual basis, during the tenure of both John Lucas and Company and Sherwin-Williams. Describe what was done with the material that was either off-specification or could not be reworked or sold.
11. Describe the manufacturing processes in which pentachlorophenol was used and the location of the process and storage area(s) at the Gibbsboro plant. Indicate the specific final product(s) from this process and whether the product was ever used at the Gibbsboro plant. Estimate the quantity of these specific final product(s) manufactured at the Gibbsboro plant, on an annual basis, during the tenure of both John Lucas and Company and Sherwin-Williams. Describe what was done with the material that was either off-specification or could not be reworked or sold.

12. Provide a listing of all historical records, reports and logs relevant to: operations, manufacturing process, raw materials used, consumption reports, product lists, personal notes/logbooks, and billing records pertaining to the operation of the Gibbsboro facility, available in Sherwin-Williams' Cleveland, Ohio facility and the Boyertown, Pennsylvania storage facility, for the period 1850 to 1977. Describe in this listing where all such documents are located.
13. Provide a specific listing of products manufactured at the Gibbsboro plant during the period that Charles Hollinger was the Gibbsboro plant manager.
14. Provide a description of areas used for disposal at the Gibbsboro plant, and in the Gibbsboro, Voorhees, Lucaston area, during the period that Charles Hollinger was the Gibbsboro plant manager.
15. The Site was sold for \$1 in 1946 by John Lucas Company to Charles Hollinger, plant manager for John Lucas and Company at the time. Two weeks later, Charles Hollinger sold a portion of this Site to Louis Wacker for \$1950. Provide details and records of these transactions, including documents relating to land assessments and/or inspections, but not including deeds.
16. In the October 19, 1995 response to Question 8 in the Route 561 Dump Site Request for Information, Alan Danzig stated that the company's first visit to the Site was in 1994. Has Sherwin-Williams undertaken a good faith search for historical documents or other information relating to any visits to the Site by John Lucas and Company and/or Sherwin-Williams representatives in the period around 1946 prior to and just after the transaction noted above in paragraph 15, with Louis Wacker?

Has Sherwin-Williams undertaken a good faith search for historical documents or other information relating to any representations made by Charles Hollinger, or anyone else, to Louis Wacker, in the period around 1946 prior to and just after the transaction noted above in paragraph 15, with

Louis Wacker, concerning the physical characteristics of the property including the land and the soil, and whether "non-hazardous" residues from the John Lucas and Company and/or Sherwin-Williams plant were deposited on the property, referenced herein as the Site?

17. Sherwin-Williams failed to provide the phone numbers for the persons (DuLaney, Williams, Gosa, Burke, Taylor, Whiteside, Dutill, Gadwood, and Lambert) listed in its response to EPA's previous 104e letter. Such persons may have worked in the Gibbsboro plant and may be knowledgeable regarding the use, storage, disposal, generation or handling of hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, and industrial wastes at the Gibbsboro plant and at this Site, the transportation of such materials to the Site, or the identity of any companies whose material may have been treated or disposed of at the Site. Include the years of employment of the above listed persons at the Gibbsboro plant and their position(s) with the company through those years.